

Cumulative Table of Cases Connecticut Appellate Reports Volume 178

(Replaces Prior Cumulative Table)

Beck & Beck, LLC v. Costello	112
<i>Action to recover unpaid legal fees; whether trial court properly dismissed amended counterclaims and cross claims on ground that defendant lacked standing to bring them where counterclaims and cross claims existed prior to date on which defendant filed bankruptcy petition and defendant failed to list them on schedule of personal property in bankruptcy proceeding; whether trial court properly concluded that bankruptcy estate owned amended counterclaims and cross claims; whether bankruptcy trustee abandoned amended counterclaims and cross claims.</i>	
Crocker v. Commissioner of Correction	191
<i>Habeas corpus; mootness; claim that incarcerated petitioner's placement in administrative segregation following fight with another inmate was illegal under terms of certain administrative directives of Department of Correction; whether appeal was moot; whether this court could afford petitioner any practical relief when, during pendency of appeal, petitioner was released from administrative segregation and transferred to out-of-state correctional facility, and petitioner's sole claim for habeas relief was to be released from administrative segregation.</i>	
Dixon v. East Coast Music Mall (Memorandum Decision)	901
Frauenglass & Associates, LLC v. Enagbare	35
<i>Contracts; action to recover unpaid legal fees; whether claims regarding attorney's fees charged by plaintiff in underlying dissolution proceeding constituted improper collateral attack on underlying judgment; reviewability of claim of newly discovered evidence of fraudulent conduct by plaintiff; failure to file motion to open underlying judgment on basis of fraud; reviewability of claim made for first time on appeal.</i>	
Housing Authority v. Rodriguez	120
<i>Summary process; motion to dismiss; claim that the trial court lacked subject matter jurisdiction because plaintiff failed to provide defendant tenant with pretermination notice as required by statute (§ 47a-15) prior to serving notice to quit; whether pretermination notice served four months prior to service of notice to quit was valid where, pursuant to § 47a-15, substantially same act or omission for which notice to quit was given recurred within six months; whether plaintiff could terminate agreement without serving second pretermination notice; claim that informal meeting with plaintiff's director conclusively resolved question of whether plaintiff could evict defendant on basis of first pretermination notice such that second notice was required pursuant to certain federal regulations.</i>	
In re Damian G.	220
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court's finding that respondent mother failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation as would encourage belief that, at some future date, she could assume responsible position in lives of her children was clearly erroneous; whether trial court reasonably could have found from evidence that mother had not gained insight regarding issues of domestic violence; whether evidence supported court's findings that it was not clear whether mother had, or could maintain, adequate or sufficient income or housing; whether there was ample evidentiary basis to support court's finding, by clear and convincing evidence, that mother's level of rehabilitation fell short and that children's need for permanency and stability ultimately should prevail; whether evidence supported trial court's finding that extent of deficiencies that continued to exist at time of trial reflected that mother was unable to benefit from continued parenting education; whether isolated error of trial court in its assessment of mother's insights into issues of domestic violence undermined court's findings as whole; claim that because several of trial court's subordinate factual findings in dispositional phase of proceeding were clearly erroneous, court's finding that termination of mother's parental rights was in best interests of children could not stand; whether mother demonstrated that any of trial court's factual findings were clearly erroneous.</i>	

In re Jacob W.	195
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court improperly concluded that maternal grandmother failed to prove lack of ongoing parent-child relationship by clear and convincing evidence; whether trial court applied incorrect legal test for determining whether there was ongoing parent-child relationship pursuant to applicable statute (§ 45a-717 [g] [2] [C]); whether trial court's inquiry should have focused foremost on whether children presently had positive feelings toward respondent father; whether trial court improperly focused inquiry on actions that father undertook to maintain relationship with children, pursuant to exception that applies where custodian has unreasonably interfered with noncustodial parent's visitation or other efforts to maintain ongoing parent-child relationship such that custodian's unreasonable interference leads inevitably to lack of ongoing parent-child relationship; whether it is only if child possesses no present positive feelings for parent, or if infant child's present feelings cannot be ascertained, that court may turn to question of interference; whether trial court could not logically have concluded both that ongoing parent-child relationship existed and that unreasonable interference inevitably prevented father from maintaining ongoing parent-child relationship; whether, even if trial court's application of test for determining whether there was ongoing parent-child relationship was legally and logically correct, court's decision could not stand where court made inconsistent findings by clear and convincing evidence both that there was interference and that there was no evidence of interference.</i>	
James v. Blackburn (Memorandum Decision)	901
Kellman v. Commissioner of Correction	63
<i>Habeas corpus; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective assistance by failing to meaningfully present and explain pretrial plea offer from state; whether habeas court's finding that petitioner failed to demonstrate that he was prejudiced by counsel's allegedly deficient performance during pretrial plea negotiations was clearly erroneous; credibility of witnesses; whether petitioner established that it was reasonably probable that he would have accepted plea offer; whether habeas court improperly determined that petitioner failed to establish claim that trial counsel was ineffective by employing deficient trial strategy that pursued extreme emotional disturbance defense at trial, without consulting with expert on that defense prior to trial; whether habeas court's finding that trial counsel's decision not to retain expert witness in pursuing extreme emotional disturbance defense was reasonable strategic decision was clearly erroneous; whether petitioner demonstrated that he was prejudiced by trial counsel's allegedly deficient performance in pursuing extreme emotional disturbance defense without consulting with expert witness.</i>	
Picard v. Guilford House, LLC	134
<i>Writ of error; challenge to financial sanctions imposed on plaintiff in error for attorney misconduct; claim that imposition of sanctions was barred by res judicata and collateral estoppel because statewide grievance committee already acted on matter by issuing reprimand to plaintiff in error; claim that underlying defendants should have been collaterally estopped from seeking court imposed sanctions because they were in privity with statewide grievance committee; whether trial court abused its discretion in amount of sanctions imposed; claim that amount of sanctions imposed was not proportional to misconduct.</i>	
Samakaab v. Dept. of Social Services.	52
<i>Employment discrimination; claim that defendant discriminated against plaintiff on basis of age, sex, national origin and prior opposition to unlawful employment practices in violation of Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act (§ 46a-51 et seq.); whether trial court properly determined that insufficient facts were presented to support prima facie case of discrimination or retaliation; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law on issues.</i>	
Sovereign Bank v. Licata	82
<i>Foreclosure; mootness; appellate jurisdiction; whether this court lacked subject matter jurisdiction and appeal was moot because defendant's interest in property had been extinguished after law days passed; whether there was any practical relief that could be afforded to defendant; whether foreclosure judgment had been stayed by appeal from counterclaim; whether initial appellate stay of execution that arose when foreclosure judgment was rendered expired after appeal period for that judgment had run; whether there was appellate stay in effect with respect to foreclosure judgment when law days began to run; whether absolute title to</i>	

<i>property transferred to plaintiff as matter of law after all law days expired; whether final judgment disposing of counterclaim is separate and distinct from judgment on associated complaint; whether foreclosure judgment gave rise to distinct appeal period and appellate stay that was not affected by stay that resulted due to appeal from judgment on counterclaim.</i>	
State v. Bialowas	179
<i>Manlaughter in second degree; evasion of responsibility in operation of motor vehicle in violation of statute ([Rev. to 2009] § 14-224 [a]); claim that trial court committed plain error by failing to instruct jury sua sponte that defendant's reasonable fear of harm from victim would be possible defense to charge pursuant to § 14-224 (a); whether defendant's claim involved error so obvious that it affected fairness of or public confidence in judicial proceeding; whether defendant demonstrated failure to instruct was so harmful or prejudicial that it resulted in manifest injustice necessitating reversal.</i>	
State v. Eddie N. C.	147
<i>Risk of injury to child; sexual assault in first degree; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting, under applicable rule of evidence (§ 4-5 [b]), prior uncharged sexual misconduct evidence; claim that prior uncharged sexual misconduct evidence was too remote in time to be admissible in light of twelve year gap between uncharged and charged sexual misconduct; whether uncharged sexual misconduct evidence was sufficiently similar to conduct with which defendant was charged; whether victim of prior uncharged sexual misconduct was sufficiently similar to victim in present case; whether trial court abused its discretion by admitting victim's statements to her mother and to health care providers pursuant to exception in rule against hearsay for statements reasonably pertinent to obtaining medical diagnosis or treatment; harmless error; unpreserved claim that trial court committed plain error by admitting opinions of medical providers that victim had been sexually assaulted; unpreserved claim that medical providers' improper vouching for victim's credibility constituted plain error; whether any evidentiary impropriety resulted in manifest injustice requiring reversal of judgment.</i>	
State v. Gill	43
<i>Murder; sufficiency of evidence; claim that state presented insufficient evidence to prove that defendant intended to cause victim's death; consciousness of guilt evidence.</i>	
State v. Jackson	16
<i>Murder; claim that trial court committed plain error in failing to give special accomplice credibility instruction regarding testimony of two witnesses; whether defendant failed to establish indisputable instructional error on part of trial court that was so clear and obvious as to require extraordinary remedy of reversal, as required under first prong of plain error doctrine; whether claim failed second prong of plain error doctrine because it did not result in manifest injustice; whether jury was presumed to have followed trial court's instructions.</i>	
State v. Manning (Memorandum Decision).	902
State v. Myers	102
<i>Murder; reviewability of claim that defendant was harmed by trial court's improper exclusion from evidence of video interview of witness who was unavailable to testify where claim was raised for first time in reply brief; claim that harm resulting from court's allegedly erroneous ruling was implicit in defendant's principal brief such that defendant did not need to brief and analyze harmfulness of ruling in principal brief.</i>	
State v. Stallworth (Memorandum Decision).	901
State v. Torres	29
<i>Murder; claim that certain portions of trial court's instruction to jury on reasonable doubt constituted plain error; claim that cumulative effect of subject portions of instruction constituted plain error; whether Appellate Court was bound by Supreme Court precedent.</i>	
Stephen J. R. v. Commissioner of Correction	1
<i>Habeas corpus; ineffective assistance of counsel; claim that habeas court improperly denied petition for certification to appeal after erroneously concluding that trial counsel had provided effective assistance despite decision not to consult with and present testimony of expert on false memory syndrome in child sexual assault cases.</i>	

Toma <i>v.</i> Ceesay (Memorandum Decision)	902
Williams <i>v.</i> Commissioner of Correction (Memorandum Decision).	902